

чения фразеологизмов *гуня мокрая, темный житель, баклан сокоревый* и др., т. к. нелегко выявить, как эти значения соотносятся с семантикой компонентов.

Анализ компонентного состава фразеологических единиц позволил нам объединить их в следующие группы:

- 1) фразеологизмы, в которых хотя бы один из компонентов – диалектное слово, например: *гуня мокрая, дегтяной логушок, необделанный баклан, ноги рогачём*;
- 2) сочетания, включающие только общенародные слова и не являющиеся в литературном языке фразеологизмами, например: *в кожу не лезет, глаза потеряны, держать шишку, колыхать век, лаптем стеганный*;
- 3) фразеологизмы, которые встречаются в литературном языке, но претерпели семантические или структурные изменения в диалектной речи, например: *быть в моде, как на блюде катается, оторви и выбрось, рубашку с себя сымет*.

Изучение диалектной фразеологии свидетельствует о том, что связь языка с историей и культурой, со всеми аспектами человеческой деятельности проявляется при исследовании тех языковых средств, которые отражают внешний облик и внутренние качества человека.

### Список литературы

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Предисловие // Логический анализ языка. Образ человека в культуре и языке / отв. ред. Н. Д. Арутюнова, И. Б. Левонтина. М., 1999. С. 3–10.
2. Рубинштейн С. Л. Учение о характере // Основы общей психологии. СПб., 2000. С. 620–633.

**А. С. Гусева**

Научный руководитель: Е. В. Жучкова,  
кандидат филологических наук, доцент (УрФУ)

### **STYLISTIC AND LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF PUBLIC POLITICAL SPEECHES BY BARACK OBAMA, GEORGE BUSH AND HILLARY CLINTON**

The fear of public speaking is the most common fear and prevents many people from achieving their potential. A majority of scientists in this field (C. Jaffe, M. McKay, P. Zielinski etc. [1; 2; 3; 4]) advise to study properly speeches of outstanding political leaders as an example of successful public speaking.

All types of public speaking and especially political speeches are traditionally characterized by a great number of linguistic devices which make them persuasive and expressive. To be more specific, all these devices can be divided

into stylistic, lexical and grammatical ones.

It is known that public speaking is a persuasive speaking that takes a less objective view on some topic and asks the audience to take action in support of that view. A speaker will urge the audience to consider why one side of an issue is worth supporting emotionally and logically. That is why this very type of public speaking requires a detailed selection of words and sentences.

In the work we have dwelt upon the most frequently used devices (stylistic and lexico-grammatical) in certain political speeches with the aim to study the effect they create.

Three political speeches were taken for the detailed analysis: that of Barack Obama (Inaugural speech, 2009), of George Bush (the Speech at the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy, 2003) and of Hillary Clinton (an Address at the Democratic National Convention in Denver, 2008).

Despite the fact that every speech is individual, stylistic devices such as anaphora, quotations, repetition, enumeration, metaphor are presented in every of these three speeches. The speaker needs to use these language tools in order to make the message persuasive and comprehensible to the listener.

Successful societies limit the power of the state and the power of the military ...and not the will of an elite. Successful societies protect freedom with the consistent and impartial rule of law, ... Successful societies allow room for healthy civic institutions – for political parties and labor unions and independent newspapers and broadcast media. Successful societies guarantee religious liberty – the right to serve and honor God without fear of persecution. Successful societies privatize their economies, and secure the rights of property. (George Bush)

G. Bush used “successful societies” 5 times, because anaphora makes the speech more powerful and impressive. Presumably, in this very context ex-president of the USA tried to call on people be successful which is equal to be happy. And anaphora helped him make his idea more effective and memorable.

...let us brave once more the icy currents, and endure what storms may come.  
The snow was stained with blood. (Barack Obama)

The aim of using metaphors is to appeal to emotions and to include and affect the audience. Politicians use language to persuade people that their thoughts, aims and ideas are equitable and to make their point clear and vivid to the people.

The use of metaphor is one of the most prominent tools for persuasion and an instrument for propaganda in political rhetorical language that is why it is widely-used nowadays.

A proud mother. A proud Democrat. A proud American. And a proud supporter of Barack Obama. (Hillary Clinton)

It was found out that each speech begins with thankfulness or address to

the audience and ends with blessing people and America. This is a common pattern, because the structure of political speech is more or less strictly defined. The beginning and the ending must be emotionally contagious and filled with a sincere desire to involve other for something important and significant.

Evaluating adjectives and numerals are presented in every case. Using them, politicians remind people about historical events of the past of the country to make audience take pride of the USA and be patriots.

Liberty is both the plan of Heaven for humanity and the *best* hope for progress here on Earth. (George Bush)

And you haven't worked so hard over the last 18 months, or endured the last eight years, to suffer through more failed leadership. (Hillary Clinton)

As for grammatical peculiarities, all the speeches are organized by using mostly Present Simple and Present Perfect, but Future Simple and Past Simple can be found as well. And inclusive pronouns such as *we*, *our* and *us* from 40 times in an Address at the Democratic National Convention in Denver by Hillary Clinton up to 142 times in the Inaugural speech 2009 by Barack Obama are presented. It creates the effect that the speaker is a part of the society and all they do – they do together.

And we are ready to lead once more...

Our economy is badly weakened...

All this we can do. All this we will do. (Barack Obama)

That is B. Obama's extraordinary use of inclusive pronouns. He used the pronoun *I* three times in the speech. In contrast, he used the pronouns *we*, *our* and *us* 142 times. The speaker's intention was to show that either all problems or all sweets are common.

The results come down to the fact that a lot of stylistic (parallel constructions, repetition, enumeration, antitheses, gradation, asyndeton, inversion, euphemisms, metaphor, metonymy and rhetorical question), lexical (direct address to the audience by special formulas, special formulas at the end of the speech, using only established and generally understood terms, evaluating adjectives, cliché, abbreviations) and grammatical (using definite categories of pronouns, verbal constructions, and attributive noun groups, genitive case and present times) peculiarities are used in political public speaking. But it is pretty possible to use all of them in one speech. Having compared these three speeches, we figured out the most common peculiarities which were mentioned in the speeches of American politicians.

There are a lot of scientific researches concerning this problem. But the conclusion is that the skills of using special linguistic devices in public political speaking is of immediate interest today because every day a lot of politicians deliver speeches and the main purpose of them is to persuade the audience.

These grammatical, lexical and stylistic devices have impact on the lan-

guage, making it more vivid and clear. Unless the audience can be emotionally involved, messages will seem inert and devoid of feeling, and will usually go unheard or unheeded. That is why it is important to know and use properly all these devices to create the effect of sincerity and frankness, which is so important for a politician.

### Список литературы

1. *Bitzer L.* The Rhetorical Situation, Philosophy and Rhetoric 1. – New York : Kindle Edition, 1968. 158 p.
2. *Jaffe C.* Public Speaking, concepts and skills for a diverse society. New York : Crown Publishers, 2004. 90 p.
3. *McKay M.* The communication skills book. CA, Oakland : New Harbinger Publications Inc, 1996. 124 p.
4. *Zielinski P.* Metaphors and Metonymy in Politics. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. MS, Brooksville : Enslow Publishers, 2001. 280 p.

**Е. А. Медведева**

Научный руководитель: Е. А. Баженова,  
доктор филологических наук, профессор (ПГНИУ)

### СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ МЕДИАТЕКСТЫ В ЛИНГВОСТИЛИСТИЧЕСКОМ АСПЕКТЕ

В современной лингвистике термин «медiateкст» определяется как «динамическая сложная единица высшего порядка, посредством которой осуществляется речевое общение в сфере массовых коммуникаций» [2, с. 3]. Это комплексный продукт журналистики, PR и рекламы, обладающий совокупностью устойчивых характеристик, связанных с функциональной определенностью современных средств массовой информации. С учетом семантики этого понятия ответ на вопрос о функционально-стилистической принадлежности медiateкстов очевиден. Это тексты публицистического стиля речи, однако в настоящее время существование единого публицистического стиля вызывает все большие сомнения. Публицистический стиль не только не обладает жесткими внутривидовыми нормами, но и теряет те общие признаки, которые 15–20 лет назад были обязательными для любого медiateкста, – наличие общественно-политической лексики, логичность, эмоциональность, отвлеченные слова с общественно-политическим значением и др. Закономерен вопрос: сохраняется ли в настоящее время публицистический стиль как единое целое и есть ли общие стилевые черты, объединяющие современные медiateксты?

Анализ материала текстов ведущих интернет-газет («Газета.Ру», «Дни.ру», «Полит.ру», «Страна.ру», «Утро.Ру», «Лента.ru») позволяет